

REMARKS

Claims 8, 10, 15, 16 and 17 have been amended in order to correct a minor error, i.e., the expression "curved edge" found in a few instances in those claims should have been -- corner edge -- for proper antecedent basis. (The claims do not positively recite a "curved edge".)

It is submitted that claim 8 was improperly rejected over Hansson et al. in view of Niebauer. Claim 8 recites a "first" downwardly sloping portion (e.g., portion 26) extending to a central floor (e.g., floor 28), and a chip former depression (e.g., depression 27) formed in the first sloping portion.

It was asserted in the Official action that Niebauer discloses a first downwardly sloping portion (50) extending to a central floor portion (column 2, lines 48-50) and a chip former depression (generally in the area of 32) formed in the sloping portion. However, reference to column 2, lines 48-50 reveals that numeral 32 designates the central floor portion in Niebauer. There is no separate depression or second sloping portion in Niebauer that could constitute the presently claimed "chip former depression" (second sloping portion). According to the rejection, the surface 32 of Niebauer must constitute both the claimed central floor portion and the chip former depression which is submitted as being improper.

Furthermore, claim 8 recites that the first sloping portion extends from "the land" and the only land recited in the claim is an "edge-reinforcing land". Niebauer discloses an edge-reinforcing land 22, but teaches to extend the sloping portion 50 from a separate planar surface 48 that is spaced inwardly from the land 22, which surface 48 does not constitute an edge-reinforcing land as that expression is understood in the art.

In order to emphasize that difference, claim 8 has been amended to recite that the edge-reinforcing land extends "from" the radial edge and the corner edge (i.e., from the edges 20 and 21, respectively of the disclosed preferred embodiment).

It is submitted that it would not have been obvious to employ Niebauer's chip-treating surface structure in the insert of Hansson et al. in a different manner than Niebauer uses it in his (Niebauer's) own insert. That is, if an artisan were to provide Niebauer's chip-treating surface structure in Hansson et al., the first sloping surface would be arranged to extend from a separate planar surface, not from the edge-reinforcing land as presently claimed.

It is noted that this amendment to claim 8 was not presented earlier, since Niebauer had not previously been relied upon to reject the claims.

In light of the foregoing, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

By: 

Alan E. Kopecki
Registration No. 25,813

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620

Date: March 3, 2004